

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY PAUL LUCERO,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-2844 KJM CSK P

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS


Orders filed October 11, 2024 and February 24, 2025 (ECF Nos. 20, 22) and a Clerk's Notice of Docket Correction filed October 17, 2024 (ECF No. 21), all served on plaintiff's address of record, were returned by the postal service on October 22, 2024, October 25, 2024 and March 3, 2025, respectively. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court orders were returned by the postal service, and plaintiff has failed to notify the Court of a current address.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Local Rule 183(b).

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections

1 with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings
2 and Recommendations.” Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within fourteen
3 days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the
4 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951
5 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

6
7 Dated: April 9, 2025

8 
9 CHI SOO KIM
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 Luc2844.33a/2
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28